

HFE
1/10**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/823,377	
	Filing Date	March 30, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Ahmet Mufit Ferman	
	Art Unit	2623	
	Examiner Name	SHANG, ANNAN Q	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	25	Attorney Docket Number	7146.0105

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (CORRECTED Appeal Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Return postcard
---	---	---

Remarks

***The fee required for this paper was paid for in the previous submission (Appeal Brief filed April 2, 2008). ***

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm	Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, L.L.P.		
Signature			
Printed Name	Kurt A. Rohlfs		
Date	April 24, 2008	Reg. No.	54,405

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Kurt A. Rohlfs	Date	April 24, 2008

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant	:	Ferman et al.	Group Art Unit	:	2623
Serial No.	:	09/823,377	Examiner	:	Shang, Annan Q.
Filed	:	March 30, 2001	Attorney Docket	:	7146.0105
Customer No.	:	55648			
Title	:	AUDIOVISUAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM			

APPELLANT'S CORRECTED BRIEF

Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung, and Stenzel, L.L.P.
Suite 1600
601 SW Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

April 24, 2008

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

BACKGROUND

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on February 4, 2008.

The fees required under 37. C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief comprises these subjects under the headings, and in the order, set forth below:

- I. Real Party in Interest
- II. Related Appeals and Interferences
- III. Status of Claims
- IV. Status of Amendments
- V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter
- VI. Grounds for Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal
- VII. Argument
- VIII. Conclusion
- IX. Claims Appendix
- X. Evidence Appendix
- XI. Related Proceedings Appendix

The final page of this brief bears the practitioner's signature.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc., assignee of the captioned application.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

There are 38 claims currently pending in the application.

B. STATUS OF ALL CLAIMS

Claims canceled: 1, 6-10, 39-42 and 49.

Claims withdrawn: None.

Claims pending: 2-5, 11-38 and 43-48.

Claims allowed: None.

Claims objected to: None.

Claims rejected: 2-5, 11-38 and 43-48.

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

Claims 2-5, 11-38 and 43-48 are on appeal.

A copy of the claims on appeal is set forth in the Claims Appendix to this Brief.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment was filed after final rejection.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed subject matter is generally directed to methods and systems that provide at least one of an audio, a video and an image to a viewer. In a first embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 2, a claimed electronic device may comprise a receptacle for receiving a selectively insertable mobile storage device that stores a usage preferences description scheme, which describes the current preferences of a user with respect to content of at least one of the

audio, an image, or video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 23, line 20 - p. 25, line 17; p. 79, lines 18-20; p. 82, lines 3-4. The device may also include a memory storing a usage history description scheme for the at least one of an audio, an image, and a video. *See, e.g.*, FIGS. 2 and 28; Specification at p. 18, lines 4-22; p. 79, lines 14-19. The usage history description scheme includes information about a user with respect to said at least one of the audio, image, and video that is based upon previous usage of the at least one of said audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, lines 21-23. The usage history description scheme also includes at least one description type defined by, at least in part, a thesaurus. *See Id.* at p. 142, lines 5-14. The thesaurus describes possible user actions, including: (1) a user pausing content; (2) a user fast forwarding content; (3) a user rewinding content; (4) a user muting content; (5) a user increasing the volume of content; (6) a user decreasing the volume of content; (7) a user randomly shuffling content; (8) a user looping content; and (9) a user copying from a CD. *Id.* at p. 173, line 4 – p. 174, line 20. The electronic device is capable of retrieving the usage preferences description scheme from the mobile storage device, when it is inserted into said receptacle, and based upon the retrieved usage preferences description scheme, automatically identifying selective portions of the content. *See* Specification at p. 70, lines 17-19. The electronic device is also capable of periodically automatically updating the usage preferences description scheme stored on the mobile storage device, based upon said usage history description scheme. *See* Specification at p. 73, lines 14-18. The user-description scheme stored on the mobile storage device includes an attribute preventing the electronic device from updating said usage preferences description scheme based on said usage history description scheme. *See* Specification at p. 74, lines 1-16.

In a second embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 11, in combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory,

a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video may be stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 23, line 20 - p. 25, line 17; p. 79, lines 18-20; p. 82, lines 3-4. The usage history description scheme contains information about a user with respect to at least one of the audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of at least one of the audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, lines 21-23. The usage history description scheme is used by the system to automatically periodically update a usage preference description of the user on the mobile storage device, while the mobile storage device is inserted in the multimedia system. *See* Specification at p. 73, lines 14-18; *Id.* at p. 74, lines 1-16. The usage history description scheme also includes content descriptions referenced by the usage history description scheme. *See Id.* at p. 13, lines 14-8; p. 70, lines 9-21. The claimed system includes referencing functionality permitting the usage history description scheme to reference selected portions of selected content descriptions. *Id.* at p. 143, lines 3-10.

In a third embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 16, in combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video may be stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 23, line 20 - p. 25, line 17; p. 79, lines 18-20; p. 82, lines 3-4. The usage history description scheme may include information about a user with respect to at least one of the audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of at least one of the audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, lines 21-23. The usage history description scheme is used by the audiovisual information management system to update a usage preference description scheme. *See* Specification at p. 73, lines 14-18; *Id.* at p. 74, lines 1-16. The usage history

description scheme is not used by the audiovisual information management system to do any actions selected from the list of (1) selecting the at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; (2) filtering the at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; and (3) searching the at least one of an audio, an image, and a video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, line 21 to p. 71, line 9. The audiovisual information management system captures content for the usage history description scheme at a selectable level of detail. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 81, lines 17-21.

In a fourth embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 24, in combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video includes information about a user with respect to at least one of the audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of at least one of the audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, lines 21-23. The usage history description scheme also includes data indicating whether personal identification information of the user is intended to be revealed to third parties. *Id.* at p. 82, lines 13-20.

In a fifth embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 28, in combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video includes information about a user with respect to the at least one of the audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of the at least one of the audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 70, lines 21-23. The audiovisual information management system permits a user to selectively define the content of the usage history description scheme at multiple levels of granularity by which the content of the usage history description scheme is automatically accumulated. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 81, line 17 to p. 82, line 5.

The content of the usage history description scheme is used to update a usage preference description scheme. *See* Specification at p. 73, lines 14-18.

In a sixth embodiment, as claimed in independent claim 34, a claimed method includes a first step of providing usage history information stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system, and containing information about a user with respect to at least one of an audio, an image, and a video, that is based upon previous usage of the at least one of the audio, image, and video. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 23, line 20 - p. 25, line 17; p. 70, lines 21-23; p. 79, lines 18-20; p. 82, lines 3-4. The claimed second step is selectively defining multiple levels of granularity by which the content of the usage history description scheme may be automatically accumulated and stored on the mobile storage device, while inserted in said multimedia system. *See, e.g.*, Specification at p. 81, line 17 to p. 82, line 5.

GROUND FOR REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED UPON APPEAL

The grounds of rejection presented for review are: (1) whether claims 24-27, and 45 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Labeeb et al, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0093792 (hereinafter Labeeb); (2) whether claims 2-5, 11-15, 28-38, 43, 44, and 46-48 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maissel et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,637,029 (hereinafter Maissel) in view of Osawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,037 (hereinafter Osawa); (3) whether claims 16 and 19-23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maissel in view of Osawa and in further view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,127,735 (hereinafter Lee); and (4) whether claims 17 and 18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maissel in view of Osawa and in further view of Lee, and in further view of Labeeb.

ARGUMENT

GROUP I (Claims 24-27 and 45)

The Examiner rejected claims 24-27, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Labeeb et al, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0093792 (hereinafter Labeeb). Independent claim 24, from which claims 25-27 and 45 respectively depend, includes the limitation of “said usage history description scheme including data indicating whether personal identification information of said user is intended to be revealed to third parties.” This limitation is not disclosed by Labeeb, and in fact, the cited reference teaches against it. *See* Labeeb at par. 2926 (stating that private information of a representative sample of viewers, approximately one in a thousand, will be randomly sampled to obtain demographic information for advertising and/or marketing purposes). The Examiner at first pointed to a disclosure in Labeeb of telephone-type “prepaid” smart cards, insertable in a set-top box, by which viewers may buy viewing time uninterrupted by advertisements, such that then that time is drawn down to zero as a user watches uninterrupted content, the user is once again exposed to advertisements. *See* Office Action dated May 3, 2007 pp. 3-4 (citing to Labeeb at par. 2911-12). The Examiner seized on the disclosure that “use of the pre-paid card protects the security of the viewer, as the EUE (end-user equipment, i.e. set top box) only has the capability to read and limited write ability only to deduct money amounts from the card.” *See* Id. at 2912. The Examiner’s reliance on this disclosure is misplaced, it being directed to security against hacking/viruses etc. as opposed to security against personal information being exposed. In any event, since the pre-paid cards, like phone cards, lack personal identification information in the first place (hence the benefit of the cards, as not requiring a subscription, billing address, etc.) these cards have utterly no reason to

include “data indicating whether personal-identification information . . . is intended to be revealed.”

In response to these arguments, the Examiner notes that Labeeb also discloses features designed to selectively protect the privacy of viewers of television content using a “privacy filter 37.” *See* Office Action dated November 2, 2007 at p. 2. This argument by the Examiner, and the cited portions of Labeeb, are irrelevant to the issue at hand. Labeeb discloses that the privacy filter is implemented by *system hardware*. Viewers who do not wish personal identification revealed to third parties (the default assumption of Labeeb) receive a device having a circuit that automatically strips personal identification information from data leaving the receiver to the content provider. Conversely, if a user agrees to provide the personal information in exchange for a discount, that user receives a special set top box that does not include the privacy filter circuit. Thus, because Labeeb implements privacy by hardware, there not only is no disclosure in that reference of “data” indicating whether information should be kept private or not, but there would never be a reason to modify Labeeb to include such data. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner’s rejection of the claims of Group I be withdrawn.

GROUP II (Claims 2-5, 34-38, and 48)

The Examiner rejected the claims of Group II under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Maissel et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,637,029 (hereinafter Maissel) in view of Osawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,037 (hereinafter Osawa). Maissel discloses a multimedia set-top box by which programming guide preference data may be recorded for a user, and a programming guide presented in conformance with those preferences. Maissel also discloses a receptacle by which a user may insert a preference profile of another person, such as

a famous person, if for some reason the user wants to use that famous person's programming guide preferences. Also, in the event that a user wants to let a friend "borrow" their preference profiles, Maissel's receptacle is capable of writing it to removable storage to be inserted in the friend's set-top box.

Independent claim 2, from which claims 3-5 depend, recites the limitation of "wherein . . . said user-description scheme *stored on said mobile storage device* includes an attribute *by which said user may* selectively prevent said electronic device from updating said usage preferences description scheme based on said usage history description scheme." (emphasis added). The Examiner's rejection fails to even allege that this limitation is disclosed by either prior art reference. The Examiner merely notes that Maissel discloses that a user description scheme is periodically updated by a user's selection history. Maissel includes no attribute that would allow a user to prevent this automatic updating process.

The Examiner seems to argue that the use of the term "may" in claim 2 means that the claimed "attribute" is not a positive recitation. The Examiner's argument is devoid of any merit. The phrase "by which *a user* may selectively prevent" describes a requisite *feature* of the *positively recited* attribute; the word "may" is used in relation to a *user option* enabled by the claimed attribute. Claim 2 thus requires an attribute that permits a user to do something that Maissel does not provide for, i.e. Maissel lacks the *user option* of preventing the user preference scheme from being automatically updated by the user history scheme. Hence, Maissel fails to disclose the claimed "attribute."

Similarly, independent claim 34, from which claims 35-38 and 48 respectively depend, recites the limitation of "selectively defining multiple levels of granularity by which the content

of said usage history description scheme may be automatically accumulated *and stored on said mobile storage device* while inserted in said multimedia system.” Again, the Examiner fails to allege that this limitation is found in the cited prior art, instead merely arguing that the limitation is not a positive recitation due to the use of the term “may” in the claim. The term “may” however, refers to the functionality of the claimed “multiple levels of granularity” and does not condition the inclusion of the claimed “multiple levels of granularity” upon a choice of a user or a system provider.

Because the Examiner’s rejection of the claims of Group II is premised upon an untenable claim interpretation, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be overturned.

GROUP III (Claims 11-15 and 43)

The Examiner rejected the claims of Group III under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Maissel et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,637,029 (hereinafter Maissel) in view of Osawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,037 (hereinafter Osawa). Independent claim 11, from which claims 12-15 and 43 depend, recites the limitation of “said usage history description scheme used by said system to automatically periodically update a usage preference description of said user *on said mobile storage device, while said mobile storage device is inserted in said multimedia system.*” This limitation is not disclosed by either Maissel or Osawa, nor does the Examiner allege that it is. The Examiner asserts that Maissel discloses that a receiver device may be used to imprint a user preference profile on a removable card inserted in the receiver, and alleges that this step is “updating” the card. Even if this is true, however, it is not relevant. The limitation requires that the preference scheme on the removable card be “updated” using the user

history scheme. Maissel merely discloses writing the *user preference scheme* stored on the permanent storage of the receiver to the removable card. Thus, Maissel does not disclose using the user *history* scheme to automatically, periodically update the usage preference scheme on the removable storage device.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the claims of Group III be overturned.

GROUP IV (Claims 16-23, and 44)

The Examiner rejected the claims of Group III under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Maissel, in view of Osawa, and in further view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,127,735 (hereinafter Lee). The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Maissel, Osawa, Lee and Labeeb.

Independent claim 16, from which claims 19-23 and 44 respectively depend, recites the limitation of a "usage history description scheme" that is stored on a mobile storage device and "is used by said audiovisual information management system to update a usage preference description scheme, and said usage history description scheme is not used by said audiovisual information management system to do any actions selected from the list of (i) selecting said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; (ii) filtering said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; and (iii) searching at least one of an audio, an image, and a video."

The information on Maissel's removable storage device is specifically used for the purposes that claim 16 requires that the information *not* be used for. The Examiner seems to argue that is if a third reference (Lee) discloses another use for the information that is not included in the claimed list, then the claim then reads on the combination. This is illogical. Even

if Lee teaches that the information on the removable storage of Maissel could be forwarded to a server and analyzed, for example, this fails to teach modifying the system of Maissel to not use the information on the removable storage for the very purposes specifically intended by the primary reference.

Because Lee fails to teach modifying the system of Maissel such that it would no longer use the information on the removable storage to do any of the actions of “selecting said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; (ii) filtering said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; and (iii) searching at least one of an audio, an image, and a video”, the Examiner’s rejection is improper, and the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims of Group IV be reversed.

GROUP V (claims 28-33, 46, and 47)

The Examiner rejected the claims of Group V under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Maissel and Osawa. Independent claim 28, from which claims 29-33, 46, and 47 respectively depend, recites the limitation of “said system permitting a user to selectively define multiple levels of granularity by which the content of said usage history description scheme is automatically accumulated, wherein the content of said usage history description scheme is used to update a usage preference description scheme.”

The Examiner alleges that the claims of Group V include the same structural elements as do the claims of Group II, and therefore rejected them on the same prior art. The claims of Group II, however, do not include the limitation quoted in the preceding paragraph, and the Examiner has cited to no specific disclosure in the prior art teaching this limitation. The applicant also notes that with respect to claim 34, which includes a similar limitation regarding “multiple levels

of granularity”, the Examiner then relied upon the claim term “may” in claim 34, which is not even present in the claims of Group V. Thus, the applicant disagrees that the Examiner’s previous rejection is even relevant to the claims of Group V, which expressly requires the step of “permitting a user to selectively define multiple levels of granularity.”

Because the cited prior art fails to disclose the limitations of claims 28-33, 46, and 47, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner’s rejection of these claims be reversed.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner’s respective rejections of claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12-79, 89-104, and 108-18 should be reversed, and the claims should be found patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kurt', followed by a series of stylized, wavy lines.

Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (503) 227-5631

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Canceled)
2. An electronic device for receiving a plurality of content comprising at least one of an audio, an image, and a video, said electronic device comprising:
 - (a) a receptacle for receiving a selectively insertable mobile storage device storing a usage preferences description scheme that describes current preferences of a user with respect to said at least one of an audio, an image, or a video comprising a plurality of frames; and
 - (b) a memory storing a usage history description scheme for said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames, said usage history description scheme comprising:
 - (i) information stored in said memory about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video; and
 - (ii) said usage history description scheme including at least one description type defined by, at least in part, a thesaurus describing possible user actions including: (i) a user pausing content; (ii) a user fast forwarding content; (iii) a user rewinding content; (iv) a user muting content; (v) a user increasing the volume of content; (vi) a user decreasing the volume of content; (vii) a user randomly shuffling content; (viii) a user looping content; and (ix) a user copying from a CD; wherein

- (c) said electronic device is capable of retrieving said usage preferences description scheme from said mobile storage device when inserted into said receptacle and, based upon the retrieved said usage preferences description scheme, automatically identifying selective portions of said content, and wherein said electronic device is capable of periodically automatically updating said usage preferences description scheme stored on said mobile storage device, based upon said usage history description scheme; and wherein
- (d) said user-description scheme stored on said mobile storage device includes an attribute by which said user may selectively prevent said electronic device from updating said usage preferences description scheme based on said usage history description scheme.

3. The electronic device of claim 2 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said audio.

4. The electronic device of claim 2 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said image.

5. The electronic device of claim 2 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said video.

6-10. (Canceled)

11. In combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an

audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames, said usage history description scheme comprising:

- (a) said usage history description scheme stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system, and containing information about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video, said usage history description scheme used by said system to automatically periodically update a usage preference description of said user on said mobile storage device, while said mobile storage device is inserted in said multimedia system;
- (b) content descriptions referenced by said usage history description scheme; and
- (c) said system including referencing functionality permitting said usage history description scheme to reference selected portions of selected said content descriptions.

12. The combination of claim 11 wherein said selected portion is to a segment of a video that the user reviews in slow motion.

13. The combination of claim 11 wherein said selected portion is to a hyperlink.

14. The combination of claim 11 wherein said selected portion is to a web site.

15. The combination of claim 11 wherein said selected portion is to an electronic program guide.

16. In combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an

audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames, said usage history description scheme comprising:

- (a) said usage history description scheme stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system, and containing information about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video where said usage history description scheme is used by said audiovisual information management system to update a usage preference description scheme, and said usage history description scheme is not used by said audiovisual information management system to do any actions selected from the list of (i) selecting said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; (ii) filtering said at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; and (iii) searching at least one of an audio, an image, and a video; and
- (b) said system capturing content for said usage history description scheme at a selectable level of detail.

17. The combination of claim 16 wherein said level of detail is based, at least in part, on the capabilities of said system.

18. The combination of claim 17 wherein said different said selectable level of detail is suitable for interchangeability with other such systems.

19. The combination of claim 16 wherein one of said selectable level captures all user actions.

20. The combination of claim 16 wherein one of said selectable level captures statistical information regarding user actions.

21. The combination of claim 16 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said audio.

22. The combination of claim 16 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said image.

23. The combination of claim 16 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said video.

24. In combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames, said usage history description scheme comprising:

- (a) information about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video; and
- (b) said usage history description scheme including data indicating whether personal identification information of said user is intended to be revealed to third parties.

25. The combination of claim 24 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said audio.

26. The combination of claim 24 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said image.

27. The combination of claim 24 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said video.

28. In combination with an audiovisual information management system resident on an electronic device having a memory, a usage history description scheme for at least one of an audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames, said usage history description scheme comprising:

- (a) information about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video; and
- (b) said system permitting a user to selectively define the content of said usage history description scheme at multiple levels of granularity by which the content of said usage history description scheme is automatically accumulated, wherein the content of said usage history description scheme is used to update a usage preference description scheme.

29. The combination of claim 28 wherein said levels of granularity are defined for multiple users.

30. The combination of claim 28 wherein said levels of granularity are used to generate personalized programming.

31. The combination of claim 28 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said audio.

32. The combination of claim 28 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said image.

33. The combination of claim 28 wherein said usage history description scheme describes information of said user with respect to said video.

34. A method of using usage history information describing at least one of an audio, an image, and a video comprising a plurality of frames comprising:

- (a) providing said usage history information stored on a mobile storage device selectively insertable into a multimedia system, and containing information about a user with respect to said at least one of said audio, image, and video based upon previous usage of said at least one of said audio, image, and video; and
- (b) selectively defining multiple levels of granularity by which the content of said usage history description scheme may be automatically accumulated and stored on said mobile storage device while inserted in said multimedia system at multiple levels of granularity.

35. The method of claim 34 wherein said levels of granularity are defined for multiple users.

36. The method of claim 34 wherein said levels of granularity are used to generate personalized programming.

37. The method of claim 34 wherein said content is used by parents to track their children's viewing habits.

38. The method of claim 37 wherein said tracking is used to control the children's access to objectionable content.

39-42. (Canceled)

43. The method of claim 11 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

44. The method of claim 16 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

45. The method of claim 24 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

46. The method of claim 28 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

47. The method of claim 28 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

48. The method of claim 34 wherein said information is processed to determine preferences of said user.

49. (Canceled)

EVIDENCE APPENDIX:

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX:

None.